



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICISMS AND DISCUSSIONS.

THE SON OF MAN.

The Galilean founders of Christianity (who were Jews by religion, although they may have been descendants of the Aryans deported by Tiglath-pileser IV to Galilee in 738 B. C.)¹ spoke Aramaic. *Taliha cumi* (Mark v. 41) and other phrases attributed to Jesus are Aramaic. The *Logia* (Q)² from which the sayings of Jesus in Matthew and Luke are derived were Aramaic.³ *Bar-nâshâ*, son of man, is the common Aramaic expression for *man*. Similarly Heb. *ben-adâm* denotes an individual of the *genus homo*. The Greek Bible renders it *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, the same expression which we find in the New Testament.

The original meaning of *bar-nâshâ* was not *filius hominis*, but *filius viri*. A person who is the *son of a man*, in contradistinction to an individual who is the *son of a nobody*, is a gentleman.⁴ The great Irish Assyriologist Edward Hincks, who died in 1866, recognized long ago that the cuneiform phrase *mâr lâ mâman*, a son of a nobody, indicated a man of low origin.⁵ Cicero used the expression *filius*

¹ See my paper "The Aryan Ancestry of Jesus" in *The Open Court*, No. 635 (April, 1909), p. 199.

² See *The Open Court*, No. 653 (October, 1910), pp. 603, 618.

³ See Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, second edition (Berlin, 1911), p. 78. On page 162 Wellhausen emphasizes the artistic and literary form of the *Logia*. Of Adolf Deissmann's view that the Sayings are on a par with the papyri scribbled by illiterates Wellhausen remarks, "It is hardly possible to make a more injudicious statement" (*Urteilsloseres kann kaum geäußert werden*). Cf. my remarks in the *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (Oxford, 1908), Vol. 1, p. 303, n. 4.

⁴ Cf. Gesenius's *Hebr. Handwörterbuch*, sixteenth edition (1915), p. 53b, line 2.

⁵ See *Records of the Past*, Vol. 3, p. 46, n. 2 (London, 1874); E. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, Vol. 1, p. 65, line 81 (Berlin, 1889); Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch* (Leipsic, 1896), p. 419b.

terrae which corresponds in some respects to the Heb. 'am ha-'ārç, unlearned.

In Hebrew, *bēnē-'adām* = *fili hominis* means *homines*, and *bēnē-'ish* = *fili viri* denotes *gentlemen*. A Maccabean poet (c. 163 B. C.) calls the Hellenizing members of the Jerusalem aristocracy *bēnē-'ish*, lords. Luther renders this correctly in Psalm iv. 2 *Liebe Herren*, dear sirs, although the Latin Bible has *fili hominum*.⁶ Our Authorized Version has *O ye sons of men*, nor has this mistranslation been corrected in the Revised Version. In Psalm xlix. 2 the Authorized Version translates Heb. *gam-bēnē-'adām gam-bēnē-'ish* correctly *both low and high*. In Psalm lxii. 9 we find *Ak-hēbl bēnē-'adām, kazáb bēnē-'ish*, Men of low degree are but vanity, men of high degree an illusion. Heb. *kazáb* denotes originally a wady which dries up during the summer. The meaning *lie* is secondary, not *vice versa*.

In the Code of Hammurabi (c. 2100 B. C.) *mār-amīli*, son of a man, is a *full-born* man, while *mushkinu*, which appears in Hebrew as *miskén*, and in French as *mesquin*, is a *free-born* man. *Mushkinu* is not a serf or bondman, but a plebeian or commoner, whereas *mār-amīli* is a patrician or nobleman. In the Old Testament, *miskén* does not mean *poor*, impecunious, but *humble*, of low origin. The *poor and wise child* in Eccl. iv. 13 alludes to Alexander Balas,⁷ who was a boy of humble origin, but a friend of the Jews. *Wise* is used for *godly*, religious, and *foolish* for *ungodly*, irreligious.⁷ Assyr. *mushkinu* is connected with Arab. *kāna*, *yakīnu*, and *istakāna*, to submit, to be humble.⁸ Assyr. *amīlu* is derived from the stem of Heb. 'amāl, labor. For the preservation of the *a*-vowel after the initial 'Ain we may compare *atūdu*, he-goat; *aqrabu*, scorpion; *adī*, until. *Amīlu* is a form like Heb. *asīr*, captive, or *nabī*, prophet; but *amīlu* does not mean *worked*, but *working*. The form *qatīl* may have the meaning of *qatīl*,⁹ so that Assyr. *amīlu* may be equivalent to Arab. 'āmil. Nor does *amīlu*, worker, denote a *laborer*, but an *employer of labor*, just as we say that a captain *works* a ship, or that a captain of industry *works* a number of mines. Two hundred

⁶ I have explained Psalm iv in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Vol. 26, p. 6.

⁷ See Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905), p. 36, n. 9; *The Book of Micah* (Chicago, 1910), p. 53, n. ‡.

⁸ See my paper on Psalm lxviii in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Vol. 23, p. 226, n. 13.

⁹ See W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, third edition (Cambridge, 1896), Vol. 1, p. 186, B.

years ago the term *manufacturer* was used in the sense of *workman*. In our terms *telegraph-operator* and *coal-operator* the word *operator* has two entirely different meanings. The Spanish *hacienda*, landed estate, manufacturing or other establishment in the country, is derived from the Lat. *facienda*, things to be done. In Scotland the manager of an estate is called *factor*, lit. *doer*, maker. This is also the original meaning of Assyr. *amīlu*.

The definition of Assyr. *mār-amīli*, son of a man, as *patrician* and *mushkīnu* as *plebeian* was correctly given by the late Prof. R. F. Harper in his translation of the Code of Hammurabi;¹⁰ but Winckler explained *mushkīnu* as *freedman*,¹¹ Delitzsch as *bondman*, and Hommel as *monk* or *Levite*.¹² Harper rendered *amīlu* by *man* or *person*, and *mushkīnu* by *freeman*, but he added (*op. cit.*, p. xii): In a few places it is almost necessary to translate *gentleman* as over against *freeman*. The Sumerian equivalent of *mushkīnu* was *mashda*. Eduard Meyer in the third edition of the first volume of his *Geschichte des Altertums* (p. 578) regards *mār-amīli* as a *free-born* man; but the *mushkīnu* is a *free-born* man, and the *mār-amīli* a *full-born* man or *gentleman*.¹³ A man may be free-born without being well-born. The term *gentleman* may, of course, be used for *man* in general. One of my colored servants once told me that the colored gentleman of the man next door wanted to see me. Few of us realize that *Mr.* meant originally *master*.

On the other hand, *baron* meant originally no more than *man*, but gradually the word came to denote a *strong* or *powerful man*, and then a *magnate*. In Italian *barone* signifies not only *baron* and *husband* (cf. the English legal phrase *baron and feme* = husband and wife) but also *scoundrel*, vagabond, rascal. Assyr. *amīlu* and *mushkīnu* may be compared to the ancient Irish *aires* who were of two classes, viz., the *flaiths*, who possessed ancestral land, and the *bo-aires* (i. e., *cow-aires*; cf. Lat *bos*) who possessed only cows and other chattels. Both classes were freemen, and the king was

¹⁰ R. F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi* (Chicago, 1904).

¹¹ Hugo Winckler, *Die Gesetze Hammurabis* (Leipsic, 1904).

¹² Fritz Hommel, *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des Alten Orients* (Munich, 1904), p. 236.

¹³ Also in Egyptian the phrase *the son of a man* denotes a *full-born man*, and in certain prophetic texts this term is used of a Messianic king; see Hugo Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* (Tübingen, 1909), Vol. 1, p. 206, n. 1. I am indebted for this reference to Dr. Albright. For the ancient Egyptian prophetic texts cf. Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, Vol. 1, third edition (Stuttgart, 1913), § 297.

elected by them. The flaiiths or lords kept slaves and had hamlets with laborers (cf. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th edition, Vol. 3, p. 422b; Vol. 14, p. 768a).

The word *man* is used in German for the impersonal subject. Instead of *you say* or *one says* the Germans say: *man says*. Also *on* in French *on dit* represents the Latin *homo*. In 1 Sam. ix. 9 we read: *Formerly, when a man in Israel went to inquire of God, he would say, Come, let us go to the seer; for he that is now called a prophet, was formerly called a seer.* It might be well to add in this connection that the term for *prophet*, Heb. *nabî*, means originally *one who is caused to speak*; the verb *hinnabê*, to prophesy, is semi-passive.¹⁴ The word for *seer*, on the other hand, denotes primarily a *scryer* or crystal-gazer.¹⁵

Our Authorized Version occasionally uses *man* in cases where the Hebrew has an impersonal phrase. In 2 Kings xxi. 13 our English Bible says: *I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria* [cf. 2 Sam. xvii. 13] *and the plummet of the House of Ahab, and I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down.* The original text has simply *as one wipes a dish*, but the rendering *as a man wipeth a dish* is said to have helped an American bride to induce her husband to assist her in washing the dishes. She had tried in vain to persuade him to help her; finally she said, even the Bible expected a man to wipe dishes, and her husband consented to do this work if she had any Scriptural authority for her demand. She called his attention to 2 Kings xxi. 13, and he submitted.

In the cuneiform proverb *Tallik tashshâ eqil nakri, illik ishshâ eqilka nakru*, Thou didst go and take the field of a stranger, the stranger came and took thy field,¹⁶ the Sumerian original has *gish-gin-e mun-gur asha lu-kurâ-ge, ni-gin un-gur asha-zu lu-kura*, A man goes and takes the field of another, the other one goes and takes thy field.¹⁷ We could also use the second or the first persons in this

¹⁴ See my paper "The Religion of the Hebrew Prophets" in the *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (Oxford, 1908), Vol. 1, p. 271.

¹⁵ See my paper "Crystal-gazing in the Old Testament" in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 36, p. 88.

¹⁶ This was correctly translated long ago by Sir Henry Rawlinson; contrast Jules Oppert, *Grande Inscription du Palais de Khorsabad* (Paris, 1863), p. 289.

¹⁷ See my paper on the impersonal construction in Sumerian in Bezold's *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. 31.

case. We could say: *If you go and take the field of somebody else, he may go and take your field*, or: *If I go and take the field of somebody else, he may go and take my field*. For I try to do my best we may say *One tries to do one's best* or *A man tries to do his best*. In vulgar parlance *fellow* is used for *man*: *Don't be hard on a fellow* means *Don't be hard on me*. The statement *A man cannot work at home if his wife insists on having the house full of guests* may be interpreted as a personal experience.

In the same way we find *son of man*, the Aramaic term for *man*, used in the Gospel for the pronoun of the first person. In Matt. viii. 20 Jesus says: *The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the son of man has not where to lay his head*. Here *son of man* = *man* is equivalent to *I*. It does not denote the Messiah. It was subsequently interpreted in this way, probably on the basis of Matt. xxvi. 64 where the passage Dan. vii. 13 is alluded to, but this was not the original signification. We read in Matt. xxvi. 64: *Ye will see the son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven*. Also in Dan. vii. 13 we must read *on the clouds of heaven*, not *with*; the Septuagint has ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν. Wellhausen states, Smend had called his attention to the fact that the man in the Danielic passage ascended to heaven on the clouds.¹⁸ The reading 'al, on, instead of 'im, with, was suggested long ago by Nestle.¹⁹ We must also follow the Septuagint in reading the perfect *âtâ* (= ἤρξετο) instead of the participle *âtê* (©, ἐρχόμενος). *Atâ-(hă)wâ* has the meaning of a pluperfect, *he had arrived or ascended*.

The phrase *kě-bar-nâshâ*, like a son of man, means *one looking like a man*. Some one might feel tempted to read *bě-bar-nâshâ* instead of *kě-bar-nâshâ*, and regard this *bě* as equivalent to the Arabic *bi* after the *idhâ 'l-mufâja'ati*, the lo! of surprise.²⁰ For *behold, a man came forward*, you find in Arabic: *idhâ bi-râjulin qad-âqbala*. In Hebrew, *ra'â*, to see, may be construed with *bě*. But *arû*, behold, occurs four times in the preceding verses of Daniel vii, and in none of these cases is it followed by *bě*. Apart from the introductory formula *hâzê hăwêth bē-hezwê lēlēyâ*, I saw in the night-visions,

¹⁸ See Wellhausen's work cited above, in n. 3, p. 86; on p. 126 he renders again: *with* the clouds.

¹⁹ E. Nestle, *Marginalien* (Tübingen, 1893), p. 40.

²⁰ According to Brockelmann's comparative syntax of the Semitic languages (Berlin, 1913), p. 36, the preposition *bi* after *idhâ* means originally *at*, with.

the two verses Dan. vii. 13, 14 consist of six lines with 3 + 2 beats,²¹ which may be translated as follows:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 13 And lo! on the clouds of heaven | had arrived one like a man; |
| He came to the Agèd Man, | and was brought before Him. |
| 14 To him was given dominion, | and glory, and rule; |
| The peoples, nations, and races | should be subject to him; |
| His dominion is everlasting, | and will not pass away; |
| His rule is for all generations, ²² | and will not be destroyed. |

The man whom Daniel in his vision saw ascending to heaven on a cloud does not represent the ideal and glorified people of Judea²³ or Michael, the guardian angel of the Jews, but the savior of Judea, Judas Maccabæus. The Book of Daniel was written about the beginning of the year 164 B. C. At that time Judas Maccabæus had defeated the Syrian armies under Apollonius, Seron, Ptolemy, Nicanor, Gorgias, Lysias.²⁴ Every nation told of the battles of Judas (1 Macc. iii. 26). The appearance of the hero is said to be *kě-bar-nâshâ*, like a man, because in his apotheosis he was transfigured. At the beginning of the Chaldean Flood tablet, Gilgamesh expresses his surprise that the appearance of his ancestor Hasis-atra, who had been translated to the gods, was unchanged.²⁵ He looked *kě-bar-nâshâ*, like a man.

Although *son of man* = *man* in this Danielic passage refers to the savior of the Jews, the use of this term in the Gospels for the Messiah is secondary.²⁶ In the Aramaic original of the *Logia* the phrase *bar-nâshâ*, son of man, simply meant *man*, but this could be used for *some one* and also for the first person.

The first Orientalist who took the term *filius hominis* in the sense of *homo* was the Archbishop of Aix, Gilbert Générard, who died in 1597. He referred for Matt. xii. 32 to 1 Sam. ii. 25. The passage in the Gospels is: *Whosoever speaks a word against the son of man* (i. e., *a man*) *may be forgiven, but whosoever speaks*

²¹ We may compare the anapestic pentameter in Browning's *Saul* and Sir Walter Scott's *Proud Maisie is in the wood, walking so early* or P. B. Shelley's *One word is too often profaned | for me to profane it*. See Haupt, *The Book of Micah* (Chicago, 1910), p. 22, n. 1, and p. 66, n. 4.

²² For the restoration of this hemistich cf. Dan. iii. 33.

²³ See Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 91 and p. 126, n. 1.

²⁴ Cf. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 3, p. 182, iii.

²⁵ See my translation of the introductory lines of the cuneiform account of the Deluge in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 25, p. 75; cf. Vol. 38, p. 61.

²⁶ Cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

against the Holy Spirit, will not be forgiven.²⁷ The Old Testament parallel cited by Générard is: *If a man sin against another man, the gods may decide,*²⁸ *but if a man sin against Jahveh, who is to pray in aid of him?*²⁹

Also the father of international law, Hugo Grotius, who died in 1645, maintained that the *son of man* in Matt. xii. 32 (*whosoever speaks a word against the son of man*) did not refer only to Christ, but to any man including Christ. He explained his view more fully in his annotation *ad* Matt. xii. 8, *The son of man is lord of the sabbath-day*, i. e., *man is above the sabbath*.³⁰

Grotius's theory was elaborated by a German clergyman, Pastor Johann Adrian Bolten, of Altona, who died in 1805.³¹ He said, if Jesus used the term *son of man* for the first person, it must be explained in the same way as the use of the German indefinite *man* instead of the first person.

Prof. Arnold Meyer, of the University of Zurich, emphasized Bolten's merits in his interesting little book *Jesu Muttersprache* (Freiburg i. B. and Leipsic, 1896). He said, however, that it was well-nigh ridiculous to explain the term *son of man* as equivalent to *some one* in apocalyptic passages like Matt. xxiv. 27 or xxvi. 64. The first passage reads: *As the lightning comes out of the east, and shines even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the son of man be.* The second verse is: *Ye will see the son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.*

We must remember, however, that the indefinite *some one* may be a veiled allusion to a very high personage. In Est. iv. 4 Mordecai tells Esther, *If thou refuse to intervene, help will come to the Jews from another place, or from another quarter*, i. e., from the Supreme Being, just as some one might say in Washington, The Secretary of State was in favor of it, but Somebody Else objected, alluding to the President. In my *Book of Esther* (Chicago, 1908), p. 41, I have quoted a number of passages from Anthony Hope's novel *Tristram of Blent*, e. g., *And if by a miracle the prime minister said yes, for all I know somebody else might say no. This dark*

²⁷ Cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

²⁸ We must read *u-fillēlū* instead of *u-fillēlō*.

²⁹ That is, become an advocate for him.

³⁰ Cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

³¹ Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, p. 34) points out that it was a German clergyman, C. G. Wilke, who showed nearly a hundred years ago (1826) that Matthew was based on Mark (cf. also *op. cit.*, pp. 109, 148, 154, 156).

reference to the Highest Quarter caused Southend to nod thoughtfully. In another passage we find: *There was now not only the very grave question whether the prime minister—to say nothing of Somebody Else—would entertain the idea.* A third passage reads: *The last words had presumably reference to the same quarter that Lady Evenswood had once described by the words "Somebody Else."* The personage alluded to is, of course, Queen Victoria.³²

When the Pythagoreans said *αὐτὸς ἔφα*, *ipse dixit*, they did not show any disrespect for their master. The Arabic grammarians say that the indefinite *-mâ* is used with an intensifying force.³³ I believe, however, that this *-mâ* is not indefinite, but identical with the Assyrian emphatic *-ma* which appears in Hebrew as *-nâ*.³⁴ The Arabic grammarians also say that an indefinite cognate accusative is employed for strengthening or magnifying, e. g., *When the earth will be shaken with a shaking*, i. e., *shaken violently* (Arab. *idhâ rújjati 'l-árdu rájjan*).³⁵ But the intensity depends here on the repetition, not on the indefiniteness. We use *some* now for *great*, *splendid*. Some years ago a Baltimore furniture dealer exhibited a fine bedstead with the laconic sign *Some Bed*.

The rationalistic theologian Professor Paulus, of Heidelberg, who died in 1851, pointed out that, if the original meaning of the phrase the *son of man* was simply *man*, the followers of Jesus combined this term with Dan. vii. 13 describing the coming of one *like a son of man* in the clouds of heaven, and regarded it as a designation of the Messiah. Paulus referred to Psalm lxxx. 17:

Be Thine arm o'er the man at Thy right hand,³⁶
o'er the son of man Thou hast raised.

Here both *man* and *son of man* are supposed to denote the Jews at the beginning of the Maccabean period, but the Targum, says Paulus, refers the *son of man* to the Messiah.³⁷ However, it is not true that

³² Dr. Ember has called my attention to the fact that the Egyptian indefinite pronoun *tw*, which corresponds to the German *man*, is often used as a respectful designation of the king; See Erman's *Aegyptische Grammatik*, third edition (Berlin, 1911), § 285.

³³ See Wright's Arabic grammar (cf. above, n. 9), Vol. 2, p. 276, B.

³⁴ See Haupt, *The Book of Esther* (Chicago, 1908), p. 49, 13.

³⁵ See Wright's Arabic grammar (cf. above, n. 9), Vol. 2, p. 55, A.

³⁶ We must read *lîmînêka*; cf. Psalm cx. 1 and my translation of Zech. vi. 13 in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 32, p. 113; also the explanation of Psalm cx. 4 in my paper "The Coronation of Zerubbabel" in Vol. 38 of the same journal and my translation of Psalm cx in the *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, Vol. 2, p. 81 (Chicago, 1918).

³⁷ See Arnold Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache* (1896), pp. 148, 159.

the Targum explains *son of man* in verse 17 (Heb. verse 18) as the Messiah; the Targum has *málkâ mēshîhâ* for *ben* in verse 15 (Heb. verse 16). Nor does *the man at the right hand* of JHVH and *the son of man whom He has raised* refer to the Jews; the man whom the poet has in mind is the savior of the Jews, Judas Maccabæus.

I cannot discuss all the passages containing the term *son of man*. Additional details may be found in Cheyne-Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica*, but Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt's excellent article on the "Son of Man" (*op. cit.*, cols. 4705-4740) should be supplemented by Wellhausen's remarks in § 13 of his introduction to the first three Gospels (1911).³⁸ Wellhausen says he agrees now with Eerdmans, of Leyden, and Lietzmann, of Jena, in denying that Jesus called Himself the *son of man*. This does not mean that Jesus did not use the phrase for the pronoun of the first person, but that He did not employ the term to designate Himself as the Messiah. In several passages we find *the son of man* where the parallels have the pronoun of the first person (e. g., Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26 and Matt. x. 33; also Luke vi. 22 and Matt. v. 11).³⁹ The passages in the Gospels in which the term *son of man* has an apocalyptic meaning represent later additions. In the oldest portions of the Gospels, which were originally Aramaic, *son of man* simply denoted *man* or *some one*, and this could be used in certain connections for the first person. But the original meaning of the term *son of man*, or rather *son of a man*, was gentleman.⁴⁰

PAUL HAUPT.

BEHAVIORISM AND THE DEFINITION OF WORDS.

The propensity of philosophical studies to lead only to interminable arguments is one of the most striking features of the whole history of philosophy. Arguments are good, but only for the sake of conclusions; and unfortunately too many philosophical disputes lead to no results. The fact that so much discussion is rendered fruitless through lack of clearness in the definition of words, makes the study of language imperative. Before talking, take thought for the instruments of speech. This is as significant an injunction as the one that bids us inquire into our means of knowing before

³⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 70, 74, 81, 85.

³⁹ Cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

⁴⁰ Cf. above, n. 13, and *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 37. p. 14.